



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,059	10/04/2005	Alexander Padiy	FR 030037	6182
24737 7590 09/12/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER NWAKAMMA, CHIBUTKE K				
ART UNIT 2627		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 09/12/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/552,059	Applicant(s) PADIY ET AL.
Examiner CHIBUIKE K. NWAKAMMA	Art Unit 2627

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See continuation sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/HOA T NGUYEN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627

/C. K. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2627

On pages 8-9 of applicants remark filed 25 August 2008, applicant argues "Miyanabe does not disclose or suggest "sampling said satellite signals to form sampled satellite signals with converters that receive a fixed clock; [and] filtering said satellite signals with adaptive filters that run on a fixed clock," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 3". And further "That is, the clock signal frequency is not fixed...Miyanabe, Miyanabe-211, and combination thereof do not disclose or suggest "sampling said satellite signals to form sampled satellite signals with converters that receive a fixed clock; [and] filtering said satellite signals with adaptive filters that run on the fixed clock," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 3.

The Examiner respectfully disagree because Miyanabe-211 discloses "sampling said satellite signals to form sampled satellite signals with converters that receive a fixed clock; [and] filtering said satellite signals with adaptive filters that run on a fixed clock," as analyzed in the rejection (see Final Office action). Further, Miyanabe discloses fixed clock as applicant admitted in the background art (page 2, lines 15-17 and 22-23). The background art (US 6134211) corresponds to Miyanabe-211. Therefore, it is clear that Miyanabe discloses fixed clock. Miyanabe-211 alone or in combination with the background information teaches the above recited limitations.

On pages 9-10, applicant argues "Miyanabe and Miyanabe-211 still do not disclose or suggest "estimating a ratio between the bit clock and the fixed clock, and taking said ratio into account during the updating act". And "There is simply no disclosure or suggestion in Miyanabe, Miyanabe-211, and Audoin, alone or in combinations, of any ratio, let alone teaching or suggesting "a ratio between a bit clock that drives the time recovery means and a fixed clock that drives the filtering means, and ... providing said ratio to said updating means," as recited in independent claim 3, and similarly and recited in independent claim 1".

The Examiner respectfully disagree because applicant admits (pages 7, lines 3-8) that a ratio is supplied by the time recovery circuit (PLL circuit) is well known and estimating a ratio is performed in some systems, mostly writable/rewritable systems. Therefore, the combination of Miyanabe, Miyanabe-211, and Audoin in combination with applicant's admission meets the claim limitation as recited.

The rejection of claims 2 and 4-8 are maintained as they depend on a rejected base claim.